

EXHIBIT "A"

-----X

-----X

-----X

[illegible]

Case No. 21-cv-7863 (VEC) (Lead)

Case No. 21-cv-8773 (VEC)

**DECLARATION OF BARRY BLACK IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

BARRY BLACK, an attorney admitted to practice before this Court, declares under penalty of perjury, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, that the following is true:

1. I am an attorney for Plaintiffs and fully familiar with the facts and circumstances of this case.
2. I respectfully submit this declaration in response to Mallory O. Sullivan's Declaration.
3. Attached as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of a declaration from Betsy Combier.
4. Attached as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of a declaration from Plaintiff Dennis Strk.
5. Attached as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of a declaration from proposed class member Patricia Catoire.

First False Assertion in Sullivan Declaration

6. The Sullivan Declaration asserts that there are two different kinds of codes in the NYCAPS system: a "problem code" and some other unnamed code, the "problem code" indicating anything from a performance issue to criminal activity, and the unspecified code flagging the absence of vaccination. Glaringly absent from Sullivan's recitation is how these codes appear to the reader. That is because there is no difference; they are one and the same.
7. Indeed, DOE Human Resources Director Eric Amato explicitly stated in an email to UFT Assistant Secretary Michael Sill and General Counsel Beth Norton that a "[p]roblem code was added to all employees who were placed on 2VM vaccine mandate leave. Our central offices placed this code on all employees who went on the leave." Ex. 1, ¶ 13, Ex. A.
8. Moreover, terminated Plaintiffs had a problem code plainly visible in their payroll portal, indicated by a "**Problem** PR" notation in their salary history tab. Ex. 2, ¶ 5, Ex. A; Ex. 1 ¶ 10 (DOE's "problem code" is also referred to as a "pr" code).

Second False Assertion in Sullivan Declaration

9. The Sullivan Declaration falsely posits that the no one outside DOE's Office of Personnel Investigations has access to the problem code. To the contrary, any non-DOE school or official that wants to learn whether a former DOE employee has a problem code in his or her personnel file can easily do so in a variety of ways. For example, non-DOE schools which offer DOE-funded positions have access to the DOE's payment portal, Galaxy, which allows them to see problem codes; indeed Plaintiffs present evidence of at least 15 former DOE employees who were not hired at non-DOE schools because the non-DOE schools discovered their problem codes. Ex. 1, ¶¶ 14-18. Simple phone calls work as well: a former UFT Special Representative explained that she used to "receive[] countless calls every week asking . . . if there was a problem code on an employee's personnel file" and that her UFT colleague next door would then check her computer and "tell [her] 'yes' or 'no' within a minute." Ex. 1, ¶ 8. In some instances, DOE representatives disclosed the problem codes to prospective employers from non-DOE schools calling to verify employment. Ex. 1, ¶ 19. In one instance, a third-party HR representative at Bright Start Learning Center of NYC—a non-DOE school operating pursuant to NYS Department of Health Bureau of Early Intervention directives—informed a former DOE employee that she had had been flagged as "ineligible" in her personnel file. Ex. 3, ¶¶ 8-9, 13.
10. It is noteworthy that such evidence was already in the record before Defendants filed the Sullivan declaration, but Defendants did not even attempt to discredit it. ECF No. 162 ¶¶ 11-13 (Plaintiff Solon was told by an official at non-DOE school that it could not hire her because of the problem code in her personnel file).


Further Evidence of Irreparable Harm

11. Plaintiffs' irreparable harm did not cease with their terminations. Instead, the problem codes in their files make them unemployable indefinitely at both DOE and non-DOE schools.
12. The UFT has stated unequivocally that such problem codes "will be removed once [they] are eligible to return to work." Ex. 1, ¶ 13, Ex. A.
13. Thus, Plaintiffs face ongoing coercion to violate their religious beliefs and become vaccinated, in order to become employable – and remove the scarlet letter from their permanent records.
14. The Court is reminded that Plaintiff Solon's problem code was removed within 24 hours of her getting vaccinated. ECF No. 162 ¶ 18.

Dated: New York, New York

June 3, 2022

Respectfully submitted,



Barry Black
Nelson Madden Black LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs
475 Park Avenue South, Suite 2800
New York, NY 10016
(212) 382-4303